## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

•
l Action No. 05-273 JJF
Y TRIAL DEMANDED

# MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 25(C)

Eastman Kodak Company ("Kodak"), a New Jersey corporation that has not previously been named or appeared in this action, respectfully moves pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(c) for an order substituting Kodak as a defendant for Mirage Systems, Inc. ("Mirage"), with respect to Counts I, II, III, IV, and V of the Complaint (D.I. 1).

This action arises out of a dispute about the ownership of United States Patent Nos. 5,138,459, 5,576,757, 6,094, 219, 6,233,010, 6,323,899, and 6,496,222 (collectively, "the patents-in-suit"). Plaintiff St. Clair Intellectual Property Consultants ("St. Clair") alleges that it is entitled to a declaratory judgment of ownership of the patents-in-suit (Count I), as well as a declaration quieting title to the patents-in-suit under several state-and federal-law theories (Counts II through V). St. Clair has also raised several tort claims against Mirage and Defendants George J. Moussally and Kenneth L Ford, arising out of Mirage's filing of an action in California Superior Court asserting ownership over the patents-in-suit (Counts VI through IX).

As set forth in the accompanying affidavit of George Moussally, Mirage transferred its right, title, and interest in the patents-in-suit to Kodak, effective as of the close of business on June 10, 2005. Affidavit of George Moussally in support of Eastman Kodak Company's Unopposed Motion for Substitution Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(c), dated June 21, 2005, ¶ 3. Pursuant to the agreement between Kodak and Mirage, Kodak has also assumed the exclusive right to control this and other litigations concerning the patents-in-suit. *Id.* at ¶ 4.

Kodak now owns all of Mirage's interest in the patents-in-suit and is therefore the proper defendant to Counts I through V of St. Clair's complaint, all of which concern ownership of the patents-in-suit. Because the transfer of Mirage's interest in the patents-in-suit occurred during the pendency of this litigation, substitution under Rule 25(c) is appropriate. *See Andrews v. Lakeshore Rehabilitation Hosp.*, 140 F.3d 1405, 1407 (11th Cir. 1998).

Accordingly, Kodak respectfully requests that this Court substitute Kodak as a defendant for Mirage, with respect to Counts I, II, III, IV, and V of the Complaint.

Dated: June 21, 2005

MORRIS, JAMES, HITCHENS & WILLIAMS LLP

Edward M. McNally (#614)
Amy A. Quinlan (#3021)
222 Delaware Avenue
P.O. Box 2306
Wilmington, DE 19899-2306
(302) 888-6800
eemcnally@morrisjames.com
aquinlan@morrisjames.com
Attorneys for Eastman Kodak Company

#### OF COUNSEL:

William F. Lee Mark D. Selwyn Louis W. Tompros WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109 (617) 526-6000

William P. DiSalvatore Caren K. Khoo Nora Q.E. Passamaneck WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 399 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022 (212) 230-8800

Eric J. Ward Amy L. Fici Catherine A. Corlett WARD NORRIS HELLER & REIDY, LLP 300 State Street Rochester, New York 14614 (585) 454-0714

### **CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 7.1.1**

Pursuant to District of Delaware Local Rule 7.1.1, counsel for Eastman Kodak Company has consulted with counsel for Plaintiff St. Clair Intellectual Property Consultants and Defendants Mirage Systems, Inc., George J. Moussally, and Kenneth L. Ford. St. Clair has not yet expressed an opinion on Eastman Kodak Company's motion. Defendants Mirage Systems, Inc., George J. Moussally, and Kenneth L. Ford do not oppose this motion.

#### MORRIS, JAMES, HITCHENS & WILLIAMS LLP

Edward M. McNally (#614) Amy A. Quinlan (#3021) 222 Delaware Avenue P.O. Box 2306

Wilmington, DE 19899

(302) 888-6800

eemcnally@morrisjames.com aquinlan@morrisjames.com

Attorneys for Eastman Kodak Company

Dated: June 21, 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

	_	
ST. CLAIR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CONSULTANTS, INC., a Michigan corporation,  Plaintiff,  v.	) ) ) ) Civil Action No. 05-273 (JJF) ) )	
MIRAGE SYSTEMS, INC., a California corporation, GEORGE J. MOUSSALLY, an individual, and KENNETH L. FORD, an individual	) ) ) )	
Defendants.		
ORDER  The above-entitled matter came before the Honorable Joseph J. Farnan on , 2005 on Eastman Kodak Company's Motion For Substitution Pursuant To		
Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(c). Based upon the motion and affidavit filed herein and all the files, records,		
and proceedings herein, and the Court being fully advised,		
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:		
Eastman Kodak Company's Motion For Substitution Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(c) is		
GRANTED.		
	The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan United States District Judge	

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Amy A. Quinlan, Esquire, hereby certify that on this 21st day of June, 2005, I electronically filed the attached Motion for Substitution Pursuant To Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(c) with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esquire Chad Michael Shandler, Esquire Richards, Layton & Finger One Rodney Square Wilmington, DE 19801

Amy A. Quinlan (#3021)

Morris James Hitchens & William LLP 222 Delaware Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

P.O. Box 2306

Wilmington, DE 19899-2306

(302) 888-6880

aquinlan@morrisjames.com